According to the DNI, the program does not allow the Government to listen in on anyone's phone calls. Nor does the information acquired include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that "the only type of information acquired under the Court's order is telephony metadata, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls." The DNI stated that the data collection was "broad in scope because more narrow collection would limit our ability to screen for and identify terrorism-related communications. Acquiring this information allows us to make connections related to terrorist activities over time."

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I have long been committed to safeguarding and protecting the constitutional rights and civil liberties of all Americans. Indeed, in 2001 I voted against the Patriot Act on the House floor because I was concerned that it did not contain sufficient protections to safeguard civil liberties, after it was rewritten from the bipartisan committee product that had strong civil liberties' protections.

I am also a charter member of the Homeland Security Committee, which is charged with the indispenable role of providing direction, guidance, and oversight to the Department of Homeland Security so that it fulfills its mission of keeping the homeland safe. So I am very familiar and sensitive to the inherent tensions between liberty and security.

I believe the questions raised by supporters of the Amash/Conyers Amendment about the NSA metadata program are legitimate, particularly the question whether there are sufficient protections for Americans' civil liberties. On the other hand, I am concerned that the amendment would also have the effect of precluding the use of section 501 to obtain an individual order for any business record (not just telephone data) about a person associated with someone who is the subject of an authorized investigation because of the defunding.

Madam Chair, striking the appropriate balance between the competing interests of national security and civil liberties requires thoughtful and careful deliberation. I believe that decisions of this scope and moment should be made in the regular legislative process where they are first vetted by the committees of jurisdiction which have the resources and expertise to examine the issues carefully, debate them fully, and to compile a legislative record that will enable the House to render a wise and informed judgment.

Because a funds limitation provision on an appropriations bill is poorly suited for this purpose, I do not support the Amash/Conyers Amendment. In contrast, I support and am an original co-sponsor of H.R. 2399, the "Limiting Internet and Blanket Electronic Review of Telecommunications and Email Act of 2013" ("LIBERT-E" Act"), introduced by Congressmen CONYERS and AMASH and look forward to working with them and Chairman GOODLATTE to ensure that this legislation is considered under regular order by the Judiciary Committee.

Similarly, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings, markup, and report favorably to the House H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," bipartisan legislation I introduced last month that will bring much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or "FISA Court." Specifically, my legislation, which is the House counterpart to bipartisan companion bill introduced in the Senate:

requires the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe;

addresses national security concerns by providing that if a decision of the FISA Court cannot be declassified without undermining national security interest, then the Attorney General shall disclose a summary of the opinion;

provides that if the Attorney General determines that even a summary of opinion would endanger national security interests, the Attorney General shall to provide a report to Congress describing the process to be implemented to declassify FISA Court opinions; and

requires the Attorney General to provide an estimate of the number of opinions that will be declassified and the number that are expected to be withheld because of national security concerns.

Madam Chair, it is critically important that legislation adopted by the House strike the proper balance between national security interests and protection of civil rights and liberties and the public's right to know. My legislation H.R. 2440, the "FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013," strikes the proper balance.

More important, by considering this legislation in regular order instead of during the truncated and expedited proceeding that is a funding limitation amendment to an appropriations bill, the danger of making an incorrect decision can be avoided and the likelihood of reaching an informed and carefully calibrated decision that will enjoy the support of a majority of the Congress and the public will be increased substantially.

For these reasons, Madam Chair, I must reluctantly oppose the Amash-Conyers Amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes:

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the partisan House Republican plan to destroy and dismantle the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Simply, this bill, H.R. 5, abandons our national commitment to equity in education for all K–12 students.

For decades, Members of Congress—on both sides of the aisle—had supported the need for targeted resources designed to help our nation's disadvantaged students and close achievement gaps. But unfortunately, House Republicans have decided to turn their backs on our most vulnerable students in this bill. They are gutting education funding. They are removing protections for students with disabilities. They are making it easier to divert money away from poor and minority students. The Republican bill abandons the children who need us the most.

There is no doubt that the current law under No Child Left Behind is in need of serious reform. I voted against No Child Left Behind in 2001 and I know Minnesota schools, educators, and parents have had problems with it from the beginning.

Today I do stand in strong support of the Democratic alternative. It repeals the inflexible Adequate Yearly Progress requirements and replaces them with a focus on student growth and preparation. It includes policies to ensure that all students have a well-rounded education including science, the arts, and languages. It supports innovations in education with investments in educational research and technology, high-quality charter schools, and comprehensive school plans to reduce bullying and keep all students safe.

Our families, our educators, and our communities deserve K–12 education legislation that ensures all students have access to a world class education. Congress should be passing legislation that invests in our neighborhood schools, supports the development of effective teachers and principals, and helps students prepare for their future careers. I urge my colleagues to embrace real education reform by voting for the Democratic alternative and against the underlying bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleagues, Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. NUGENT, for their work on this important amendment.

Going forward, it is critical that we ensure our defense spending in no way disproportionally and unfairly impacts our Guard and Reserve, which this amendment would prevent.

America faces an unusual national defense crisis.

It's not that we are at risk of anyone surpassing our military might; America remains by far the most powerful nation on the planet.

The problem is that the way we invest in our military is not sustainable. The U.S. accounts for almost half of worldwide military spending, more than the next 14 countries combined.

We must find a way to maintain our strength, but spend less and smarter. This should be done by placing a greater emphasis on the role of our National Guard and Reserve to strengthen national readiness going forward.